



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,569	07/22/2003	Akiko Miyano	Q76408	6558
23373	7590	10/18/2006	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			DESAI, ANISH P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/623,569	MIYANO ET AL.
	Examiner Anish Desai	Art Unit 1771

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 9-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1 and 9-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 100606.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

The applicant's arguments in response to the Advisory Action dated 08/24/06 have been fully considered and they are found persuasive.

1. Art rejections of Ho et al. (US 5,468,532) and Mueller et al. (US 6,180,228B1) are withdrawn in view of the present amendment and response (see page 2 of 09/08/06 amendment). Ho and Muller do not teach a pressure-sensitive adhesive layer as an outermost layer as claimed in claim 1. However, upon further consideration a new ground of rejection is made in view of Vesley et al. (US 4,950,537).
2. The obviousness-type double patenting rejections are withdrawn because the terminal disclaimer filed on 08/10/06 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of US Application No. 11/041,394 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 9-13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vesley et al. (US 4,950,537).

Vesley teaches a foam like pressure-sensitive adhesive tape comprising a flexible carrier supporting one or more pressure-sensitive adhesive layers, at least one

layer of the pressure-sensitive adhesive having a pigment-coated microbubbles dispersed therein (abstract). Further, Vesley teaches that the adhesive tape of the invention can have any desired color (column 2, lines 53-54). Moreover, Vesley discloses a double-coated (double-sided) adhesive tape at column 8, lines 39-43). The examiner is equating more than one layer of pressure-sensitive adhesive as a substrate as claimed in claim 1 and a supporting substrate as claimed in claims 15 and 16.

Vesley is silent as to teaching of substrate comprising colored layers comprising a white layer, a layer of color other than white and black which is a silver layer, and a black layer which are superposed in this order, supporting substrate is a transparent substrate film, supporting substrate is a white substrate film. However it is the examiner's position that choosing a desired color is well known in the art, because Vesley teaches that the adhesive tape of the invention can have any desired color (column 2, lines 53-54). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the tape substrate comprising colored layers comprising a white layer, a layer of color other than white and black which is a silver layer, and a black layer which are superposed in this order, supporting substrate is a transparent substrate film, and supporting substrate is a white substrate film, motivated by the desire to provide aesthetically pleasing pressure-sensitive adhesive tape. Further with respect to claim 13, the recitation "for use in fixing a liquid-crystal display module unit to a backlight unit" is considered as a mere intended use of the double-sided pressure sensitive adhesive tape. Although, Vesley does not explicitly teach said intended use of the double-sided adhesive tape, it is the examiner's position

that in absence of any unexpected results, the double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive tape of Vesley is capable of being used for such intended use.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vesley et al. (US 4,950,537) in view of Kameyama et al. (US 6,166,799).

The invention of Vesley is previously disclosed. Vesley is silent as to teaching of a liquid crystal display comprising a liquid-crystal display module unit and a backlight unit, wherein the display module unit and the backlight unit being fixed to each other with the double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive tape of claim 1. However, Kameyama teaches a liquid crystal element. Further Kameyama teaches that it is preferred that the components have been bonded and united with each other through a pressure-sensitive adhesive (column 14, lines 8-10). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the liquid crystal element as disclosed by Kameyama and bonded the components with the double-sided adhesive tape of Vesley, motivated by the desire to bond the components of liquid crystal element.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anish Desai whose telephone number is 571-272-6467. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

APD



TERREL MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700